DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 070 IR 014 654

AUTHOR Calvert, Jocelyn
TITLE Distance Education Research: The Rocky Courtship of Scholarship and Practice.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the World Conference on Distance Education (14th, Oslo, Norway, August 9-16, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; *Distance Education; Foreign Countries; Literature Reviews; Open Universities; Postsecondary Education; *Research and Development; *Research Design; Research Utilization; *Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

The current challenge in distance education is to determine the ways in which research can assist practice in fostering communication. Research in distance education may be broken down into three approaches: (1) practical and descriptive studies that give little attention to conceptual underpinnings; (2) application of conceptual models from related disciplines; and (3) construction of an independent structure and theory for distance education distinct from other forms of education. Distance education themes such as understanding the learner, independence and autonomy of the learner, and communication media and strategies, are common across all three research approaches. Also common are the practical questions that need to be answered: (1) On what basis are basic decisions made? (2) What are the methods for measurement? (3) What are the general principles involved? and (4) What is the conceptual framework? Researchers work to elucidate the fundamental ideas behind distance education problems and to develop a broader understanding. However, distance education practitioners may need to be convinced of the value of research as a useful contribution to practice. Clarity of presentation of research results, easy access to research, and postgraduate programs for professionals are ways to accomplish that goal. (69 references) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325070

ICDE – 14TH WORLD CONFERENCE ON DISTANCE EDUCATION
«DEVELOPING DISTANCE EDUCATION»
Keynote paper
Theme: Research in Distance Education

Jocelyn Calvert
is Director of Administrative Studies and Social Sciences at British Columbia Open University in Canada.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jocelyn Calvert

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Distance education research: The rocky courtship of scholarship and practice

JOCELYN CALVERT

Scholarship and practice are strong-willed individuals engaged in a courtship dance that dates back to childhood. Scholarship is the perennial suitor, stolid and persistent. It presses its case at every opportunity, clad in respectability and intoning its virtues. Practice is flirtatious but fickle, dancing polite attendance one minute, but then rushing off in search of more exciting company, to where the action is. Practice has been ambivalent about scholarship, acknowledging the good sense of an association but bored with the company. Scholarship has kindled a flicker of excitement from time to time, but has never managed to fan it into the ardour that will lead to marriage.

In distance education, research is the place where scholarship and practice meet and the occasion is frequently fraught with tension. One event that illustrated the problems in the relationship was a research audio teleconference mounted this year by the Canadian Association for Distance Education. The participants were drawn from across the country and represented many types of institutions engaged in distance teaching. In preparation, several people with demonstrated research interests were interviewed about their diverse approaches and transcripts of the interviews were circulated before the event. The format of the teleconference, which was ably managed, involved statements by those who had been interviewed, some debate amongst them, and questions and comments from the numerous groups linked together for this hour of discussion.

I took an impressionistic approach to the affair, for I was out of the country when the teleconference was organized and occupied with other business when it took place. I scanned the interview transcripts and borrowed an audiotape which I listened to in the car while I was trying to find the best route through rush hour traffic. Odd to say, this slapdash monitoring has crystallized my perceptions of the research dilemma when regular reading of the burgeoning literature and debates in my own institution about our research role had only left me perplexed.

In the teleconference, disembodied voices espoused theoretical approaches in language that could only have been meaningful to people reared in the same branch of the same discipline. One person spoke about cybernetics and someone else questioned whether a model based on cybernetic systems could say anything relevant to distance educators. Someone apologized for having mentioned Marshall McLuhan in the same breath as critical theory, and we then heard references to Habermas and to David Harris (1987). The person who advocated Donald Shon's *The*

IR014654

reflective practitioner (1983) was cautioned not to be taken in by that point of view. And a discussion of qualitative and quantitative methods was brought up short by the comment that there is an alternative to these.

And then a voice from one of our more isolated sites piped in to say, «We aren't sure about all this theory, but we're grappling with the question of teleconferencing (or was it computer conferencing?) and we wonder whether anyone can point us to some research that will help us with this.» This was the voice of the practitioner – the administrator who is trying to develop and manage programs that are effective and efficient; the instructional designer who has to explore the use of a variety of teaching methods for different types of learner; the faculty member who knows how to teach and just wants to get on with the job in this different context.

On one side, then, we have a multitude of practical issues to solve. With the regular appearance of new open universities to serve the heavy demand for educational opportunities, the movement towards lifelong learning in a world of rapid change, and enrolments that now number in the millions, practitioners have been occupied with the work of providing educational programmes, their research interests focussed on issues affecting their immediate circumstances. Scholarship, on the other side, is represented by the voices of individuals whose academic backgrounds reflect a variety of academic disciplines, socialized to theory and research, and seeking ways to apply their specialized knowledge to a fertile field of endeavour. In our institutions, scholarship is often marginal, walled off in different faculties or in separate research units whose usefulness is regularly questioned. When distance education scholars are integrated into the mainstream, it is generally in the role of practitioner, with research a sideline pursued when other demands have been met.

Our challenge is to determine the ways in which scholarship can assist practice in distance education and then to find ways of fostering communication so that its impact is felt. By clearly placing scholarship in the service of practice, I am emphasizing that practice will be the ultimate judge and that scholarship must be perceived to be useful. If practice is flirtatious but fickle, we must assume that scholarship has not yet pressed its suit effectively. We mus ask first whether its virtues are worth the commitment and, if we conclude they are, how practice can be convinced.

THE PRACTITIONER'S PERSPECTIVE ON RESEARCH

The people who run distance learning programmes are for the most part not practicing academics. In Canada, for example, only half of the professional staff in continuing education units hold faculty appointments, only one-third hold doctoral degrees and half do not engage in any research at all (Bains, 1985). Furthermore, the vast majority of people working in distance education, either as subject experts or as professionals, have not done postgraduate studies in adult education and require training in the different aspects of development and delivery in which they are involved. This is important for new staff in existing distance teaching institutions and particularly in new institutions that must draw their future experts from an inexperienced pool (Paul, 1987; Reddy, 1987).

These distance education professionals recognize that they have information needs of a practical variety to address their day-to-day problems. What is the best way to organize and administer programmes? How can they achieve the best value for available money? How should they design learning programmes to meet the needs of their students? What can different technologies offer? How should they measure and interpret student outcomes? Translated into research problems, these needs suggest analysis of institutional statistics, surveys to address specific questions and pilot tests of new methods. Monitoring and evaluation on the go will seem the most attractive route (Bates, 1981).

Practitioners also control the gateway to research opportunities, and they have limited patience for arcane theorizing with little apparent relevance to their perceived needs. They are the ones who provide access to samples and data in their programmes. The often shaky existence of research units and research programmes around the world demonstrates that practitioners can be harsh judges when usefulness is at issue.

While practitioners may, in their reflective moments, have an intrinsic interest in conceptual models of what they do, their interest in research is guided largely by extrinsic motivators. First is the challenge of decision-making. Limited resources and an array of options for organization, recruitment, teaching methods and technology require hard decisions. The successful system will monitor, document and pay close attention to experience in other venues. This is bolstered by the matter of accountability. Attention is focussed on distance education as a potential solution to problems of access, and this attention encompasses high expectations and the challenge of alternatives. Finally, we cannot ignore personal re-

wards. The prestige of a distance education institution and its professionals is enhanced by a record of thoughtful analysis and publication.

This assessment leads to the conclusion that practitioners must want to be not only informed consumers of research, but active partners in the process – so long as it contributes solutions to practical problems along the way. Scholarship, which offers critical appraisal, has addressed issues through three approaches: practical and descriptive studies that give little attention to conceptual underpinnings, application of conceptual models from related disciplines, and construction of an independent structure and theory for distance education distinct from other forms of education.

DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH

The first approach, descriptive research on practices and outcomes, is most common in the literature. Institutional case studies often contain concrete information on student characteristics, student outcomes, enrolment patterns and the efficiency of administrative procedures (e.g. Rumble and Harry, 1982; Ellis and Mugridge, 1983; Tinners and Mugridge, 1986; Lamy and Henri, 1983). Programme evaluations may provide sufficient detail to permit the reader to assess the authors' conclusions (e.g. Taylor and Kaye, 1986; Shavelson *et al.*, 1987). Demographic reports relate the predictions that guided programme development to subsequent enrolment and success patterns (McIntosh *et al.*, 1980). Surveys on special topics supply information on access to delivery technology, study preferences and reasons for dropout (e.g. Durward and Durward, 1983; Kember, 1982).

Such descriptive research usually is treated as context specific and evidence that the writers perceive it this way can be taken from the fact that references to other work are seldom made. In fact, the notion that each institutional context is unique and requires its own solutions has enjoyed broad popularity, justifying rejection of existing institutional models in favour of new ones (Ellis and Mugridge, 1983) and even giving some solace for rejection of requests for foreign aid on the grounds that with aid comes the imposition of technology and scale that cannot be managed alone by the recipient (Ansere, 1982). Yet, if the rich body of information and ideas contained in descriptive reports is context bound, we have created a body of literature whose main value lies in its historical interest.

I suspect, however, that most distance educators do believe that information collected in one context may apply to others and that they read descriptive articles to glean ideas that they might profitably adopt. To the extent that they do this, they are espousing the principle of generalisability, one of the cornerstones of empirical research. Moore (1985) commented that writers on distance education do not frequently enough cite other related work in the field, but perhaps more than citations are needed. Comparative analyses of the descriptive literature could isolate factors that have been addressed in different contexts and assess the extent to which observations cross regional and cultural boundaries. Until someone undertakes this task, we are left with impressions that strike us when we read our monthly stock of journals. Two that come to mind are fairly trivial but illustrate the point. The personal obstacles to completing programmes of study that students cite in Papua New Guinea (Kember, 1982) are not substantively different from those given in other parts of the world. And Peruniak's (1984) observation that students in Canada who are given the option of attending face-to-face tutorials will generally choose not to attend is supported by anectodal evidence from Universitas Terbuka in Indonesia and Sukhothai Thammathirat Open University in Thailand.

APPLYING THE THEORIES AND METHODS OF RELATED DISCIPLINES

A second approach applies principles derived from other disciplines to make sense of aspects of distance education. Implicit in this approach is the view that distance education encompasses a particular set of circumstances, each feature of which is but an example of phenomena that have been studied in other contexts. By drawing on a wider body of literature that has established principles and methods of study, we can hope to illuminate the immediate problem and add to the broader base of knowledge. In a field which draws its professionals from a variety of disciplines, such applications are bound to be popular and may be particularly fruitful. The danger is that, coming from academic boxes that typically have little converse with one another, we may feel from time to time as though we are residing in the Tower of Babel.

Examples of attempts to apply theories and methods from relevant disciplines are numerous. The first stage of the process is an analysis of a research area in the context of distance education issues. Among published reports of this process are Baath's (1982a) analysis of theories of instruction for their applicability to course design. Thompson's (1984) assessment of the usefulness of the concept of field dependence of understan-

ding different students' approaches to study, Minni's (1985) presentation of methods used by sociologists and anthropologists for consideration as research tools, Howard's (1985) review of the literature on study skills, Atman's (1987) advocacy of the concept of conation and Kember and Harper's (1987) assessment of the relevance of the broader literature on approaches to study. A widely cited example is Moore's (1977; 1986) work on independent and self-directed learning and its application to distance education.

The next stage in applying theories and methods is actual research employing the principles. Here, examples include Sweet's (1986) use of Tinto's (1975) model of student attrition to analyze dropout from distance learning programmes, Gitau's (1987) proposed application of principles of achievement motivation, and Taylor and Kaye's (1986) application of principles of andragogy to a course of instruction (see also Burge, 1984). On a larger scale is Harris's (1987) application of critical theory to the analysis of four elements of the British Open University system – student access, the design of the teaching system, student assessment and the process of teaching and learning.

Unfortunately, and surprisingly, published articles that detail the application of a particular research tradition seldom generate the flurry of debate, replication and refinement that is customary in other fields of study, nor is there much evidence that the principles derived from this work have an impact on practice. Consequently, we are left too often with isolated reports that remain as context-bound as the descriptive research described in the previous section. The goal of theory is to develop general principles, test them in different contexts and refine them to improve predictability. In distance education we are making little progress on this front.

Few writers have been more persistent in propounding a particular point of view than Coldeway (1982;1987; Coldeway and Spencer, 1982). Operating in a behaviourist tradition, he has guided a large research project (Project REDEAL) at Athabasca University that involved several experimental studies on the management and motivation of student learning; he has promoted Keller's personalized system of instruction as a basic distance learning paradigm; and he has argued that «PSI (as defined by Keller 1968), distance learning (as represented by individualized, distance learning), I(nstructional) S(ystems) D(esign) (as an instructional planning model), and behaviour analysis (as an epistemology) articulate together to form the basis of an instructional theory» (Coldeway, 1987, 10). The response in the distance education literature to this systematic analysis, as he notes in his most recent article, is absolute silence. Certainly we must infer that this silence may stem in part from the current unpopularity of behaviourism and of the positivist tradition in general. However, his frustration over the complete absence even of discussion of the merits of his viewpoint is very likely echoed by others around the world whose contributions have been similarly ignored.

DISTANCE EDUCATION AS A SEPARATE DISCIPLINE

The third approach to scholarship in distance education focusses on the distinctive characteristics of distance education and defines it as a separate field of study or discipline. It differs from descriptive research in its attention to underlying principles and from applications of other disciplines in its independence (overtly, at least) from the concepts of other fields of study.

The theme that distance education is sufficiently different from other types of education as to merit recognition as a separate field of study has had proponents in several quarters. Keegan (1980) introduced the new breed of distance educator to the ideas of Otto Peters (elaborated in Peters, 1983) and put forward a definition of distance education as an industrialised process with unique qualities. Holmberg, who has documented the progress of distance education research (1982), argued that distance education can be construed as a separate discipline on the grounds that it has an established research tradition and a curriculum of study (1986, 29). Perraton (1987) enumerated propositions concerning distance education in the areas of teaching, administration and assessment, in a style that invites empirical test. Henri (1985) outlined the differences between distance and traditional models.

Whether understanding of distance will benefit most from treatment as a separate discipline is the subject of some debate (see Sparkes, 1983). Some of those most closely associated with identification of the distinctive characteristics of distance education may well agree that the constructs of other fields of study are relevant. Another group, using concepts derived from sociological theory, is emerging with arguments for independent development of constructs. Garrison (1987), in an analysis of the dropout question, suggested that researchers work to identify basic principles before looking for applicable theories. This view is suggestive of the general approach of grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) which uses observation to generate theory from data (see Minnis, 1985).

Discussions about a separate discipline may be relegated to the archives as we move from a concept of distance education to one of open learning

(Farrell and Haughey, 1986; Foks, 1987). Smith and Kelly (1987) noted convergence between distance education and the mainstream in teaching-learning systems and clienteles for education, and predicted that this convergence would grow. However, this does not preclude the possibility that focussing directly on the distinctive features of distance education can contribute substantially to our understanding of educational processes by raising issues that typically are ignored by most educators. Writers continue to debate definitions of distance education (Thompson, 1986; Garrison and Shale, 1987), and themes that stand out as particularly important may be treated as independent topics or viewed in the context of such broader subjects as adult learning, communication and information technology.

DISTINCTIVE THEMES FROM DISTANCE EDUCATION

The nature of distance education, with its separation of teacher and learner (Keegan, 1980), emphasizes (or perhaps exaggerates) certain issues in the educational process. For this reason, distance education settings provide a good medium for studying these issues, and the results of systematic investigation may be expected to contribute to broader understanding.

Understanding the learner. The fact that learners in distance education are not present with the instructor in a classroom makes salient the question of who they are and how they work. Thus, while the same could be asked about learners in the classroom, distance educators are particularly likely to focus on the characteristics of their students. Demographic reports permit comparison of student populations with institutional objectives on general characteristics such as region of residence, age, occupation and educational background. Surveys probe for student perceptions of study problems, programme quality and reasons for dropout. However, though this type of work is recognized as essential for institutional management, there is growing criticism of its usefulness for a real understanding of students. Harris (1987) noted that educational technologists at the British Open University uncovered new information about the way students approach study when they began to supplement questionnaire studies with intensive interviews, and he provided some illuminating examples. Interviews and questionnaires have been used in other settings to analyse approaches to study and reveal considerable diversity (e.g. Clyde *et al.*, 1983; Dodds and Lawrence, 1983; Kember and Harper, 1987; Kelly and Shapcott, 1987). Recently, Herrmann (1988) advocated a shift from institution-centred to learner-centred analysis to understand transitions in students' perceptions of their goals and motives.

Independence and autonomy. Learners in distance education are expected to work in greater isolation than their classroom counterparts, and since dropout is a perennial concern in distance education, attention focusses on how to foster independent achievement. Interest in this subject is enhanced by its centrality in theories of adult learning (Knowles, 1970) and by the trend to lifelong learning (Knapper, 1988). Moore (1977) employed the concepts of structure and dialogue in his theory of independent learning and has applied these dimensions in his analysis of self-directed learning (1986). Henri and Kaye (1985) argued that one of the main tasks of distance education is to foster not only the ability to work independently but also learner autonomy, the exercise of personal choice. Garrison and Baynton (1987) suggested that students must have the freedom to make choices, the ability and skills to take responsibility for learning and access to resources necessary for learning. Summarised this way, their analysis echoes Morgan's (1986) caution that independent study must be more than the situation students are faced with when institutional support is not available.

Communication. From instructional design to tutoring systems to uses of the variety of technologies now available, communication is a central concern in distance education. This stems from the noncontiguous nature of distance teaching, the separation of students from instructors and their peers, and the fact that distance educators generally have a much wider range of options than the classroom instructor. The profound change in the nature of teaching in a distance education system (Henri and Kaye, 1985; Calvert, 1986) leads naturally to questions about what teachers communicate and how. The lack of group contact leads to questions about what functions the peer group normally serves in the educational process and how its useful features can be replicated. There has been some discussion of whether aspects of what is normally valued in human interaction can be achieved through technical means, by creating interactive text or through the use of computer programmes (Daniel and Marquis, 1979; Baath, 1982b; Daniel, 1983; Holmberg, 1983; Garrison, 1985). More attractive to many distance educators, however, are technologies that actually put learners and their instructors in touch. In many parts of the world, the postal system is being replaced by audio and computer teleconferencing (Garrison and Shale, 1987; Bates, 1986; Harasim, 1986).

WHAT CAN THEORY AND RESEARCH CONTRIBUTE TO PRACTICE?

To return to the question of what scholarship in distance education can contribute to practice, we must consider again the research needs of practitioners. To bring these into focus, we can consider a list compiled during a meeting in 1984 sponsored by the International Development Research Centre, Universiti Sains Malaysia and the Distance Education Council of Asia (Neilsen, 1984). Participants were drawn from seven institutions in Pakistan, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, the United Kingdom and Canada.

The list is presented in point form and not always easy to interpret, but several items suggest a need for straightforward analysis in connection with specific programmes. Among these are assessment of the conditions, problems and needs of various groups for pre-programme planning; assessment of the feasibility of courses with regard to the availability of needed resources; assessment of the equivalence of different courses or work experience; job analysis for work-oriented courses; success in meeting student needs for certification and skills; and assessment of acceptance of course graduates.

Equally represented on the list, however, are more basic questions about the process of distance education. In this category are matching learner needs with instructional capabilities; assessment of learning patterns such as time on a task and sequence of learning; assessment of appropriate media mix according to course content and audience characteristics; appropriateness and effectiveness of materials, support systems, assessment methods and course objectives; and experimentation with various media and systems.

One interesting observation that can be made about this list is that it is probably not very different from what would be generated in other parts of the world, in developed and developing countries. Institutions operating under vastly different conditions, with great variations in resources, have the same needs for institutional research, needs assessment, programme evaluation, and basic research to guide their decisions. Scholarship should be contributing to the solution of the practical questions of practitioners at several levels.

Data for decision-making. The first line of research is to amass information for basic decision-making. Through analysis of institutional statistics, careful monitoring and evaluation of programmes and selective targeted studies, researchers provide interpretive reports that address questions of particular import for their organizations. This type of research will generally fall under the category that I have labelled «descriptive research» and will be employed mainly in its specific context. However, the sensitive researcher will consider results in relation to similar work in other programmes and other institutions and will draw attention to similarities and differences. While this sort of comparison may take place frequently, it seldom is made public, and I can think of only one published example of an institution systematically considering the experience of another in its planning process (van Enckevort, 1984). It is doubtful whether the perceived insularity of experience is justified.

Methods for measurement. The social sciences have a rich array of methodological resources for research, and debates amongst factions should probably be set aside in favour of eclecticism. While Harris (1987) has exposed some of the limitations of the positivist approach of educational technologists of the previous decade, he did not repudiate their work out of hand. To address questions adequately, researchers will employ methods that are appropriate to the question and represent the most efficient route to a reasonable answer.

Establishment of general principles. There is a tendency for distance educators to believe that their circumstances are unique and require independent interpretation. This inclination is most pronounced in comparisons between developing and industrialised countries but it is not limited to such comparisons. While the circumstances of one institution or region may justify caution about accepting the analyses and solutions of others, wholesale adoption of this isolationist stance is unwise. The systematic search for general principles that apply in different contexts is a cornerstone of scholarship, and widespread dissemination of research results obtained in different venues can help us identify basic characteristics of behaviour and establish the limits of their applicability. Taylor *et al.* (1986), in a study sponsored by ICDE, compared the effect of assignment turnaround time on student persistence in institutions around the world. While their work illustrated the difficulties of comparative research, it also made the point that some aspects of distance education are of universal interest.

Development of conceptual frameworks. Distance education poses a special array of problems for educators and these have been explored in the literature of the last fifteen years. An increasing number of writers have also been working to elucidate the fundamental ideas behind these problems and to develop conceptual frameworks that will contribute to broader understanding. This progress reflects the path that Sparkes (1983) prescribed for the development of new

disciplines. Beyond continuing in this vein, the tasks facing researchers are to integrate the diverse «mini-theories» that have evolved largely in isolation from one another and to relate these more clearly to the concrete experiences of distance education practice.

ENGAGING THE PRACTITIONERS

It is one thing to outline what useful contributions scholarship can make to practice, but another to convince practitioners of the value of these contributions. The answers lie in education and presentation.

Clarity of presentation. Academic writing, aiming at precision, has a reputation for obfuscation and, as Bolton (1986) pointed out, the distance education in literature is not free of this tendency. In a multi-disciplinary field there is the added problem of lack of communication among the various fields from which distance educators and their theoretical constructs are drawn. It is obvious that writers about distance education should follow the same guidelines we set for design of our courses. These include simple and direct writing, the use of analogies and concrete examples relevant to the reader's experience, and explanation of any terms and concepts with which the reader may not be familiar.

Basic training in research principles. In our institutions, in developing and industrialised countries, many of the people we employ as professionals have little or no research training or experience. Yet skills in analysis are esential for critical appraisal of practice. One model for research training is a project based approach that couples development of a feasible and personally relevant research project with basic training in the fundamental principles of research – proposal development, definition of variables, the distinction between association and causation, research strategies, sampling, measurement instruments, data analysis, and budgeting. Last January at Universitas Terbuka, I had an opportunity to test this model in a week-long workshop for academic administrative staff, most of whom had only first degrees. The results were positive, enthusiasm was high, and the experience led me to the conclusion that we should be developing self-paced, project based research training materials that can be used in flexible ways in different situations.

Access to the literature. The distance education literature is now voluminous. For the last three years, I have used a computer to organize a working bibliographic database of the literature I have used in my own work. At last count, this database contained references from 43 different periodicals and 27 books, not to mention a great number of monographs and unpublished reports, yet it reflects only a fraction of what is available to me through a dedicated distance education library that my institution maintains. I am not unappreciative of my good fortune, nor am I unaware of the fact that access to such a rich collection is rare among distance educators. Even in universities in British Columbia that have extensive distance education programmes, access to the literature is limited. In the summer, a substantial chunk of our collection moves to Simon Fraser University to support a graduate course, and graduate students from the University of British Columbia are frequently seen in our library tracking down references that were not otherwise available to them. Clearly, the documentation service of the International Centre for Distance Learning (Harry, 1986) is one of the most important developments for the advancement of knowledge in our field. Through assiduous collection, subject searches, dissemination via an on-line database, and the use of regional clearinghouses, it is creating an invaluable service.

Postgraduate programmes for professionals. To date the opportunities for specialized postgraduate work in distance education have been limited. Recently, the Graduate Diploma in Distance Education of the South Australian College of Advanced Education was approved for offer to overseas students via distance education. Beyond this, those seeking specialized study generally must attempt to map out a programme of study within a related field. However, there are now a number of tentative discussions underway aimed at using international collaboration as a vehicle for programme development, and we can hope that these discussions will lead to fruitful outcomes.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

When I began writing this paper, I was reminded of a session I attended at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association in 1973. The title was «Women's Studies: Scholarship versus Advocacy», and I was very much in the minority in believing that it was silly to set the two approaches in conflict. Time, I think, has shown that scholarship and advocacy in women's studies not only can co-exist in harmony, but also can make positive contributions to one another and jointly advance their common cause.

While we do not see the same degree of fervour in discussions of distance education, the seeds of a similar debate are evident. Practice has a cause to serve and scholarship wants to analyse it. There is room for both and a need for continuing commu-

nication between the two groups. To the extent that practice is willing to embrace reflection and analysis and scholarship is able to relate its constructs in meaningful terms to the complex practical world, we can look forward to a long and productive association.

REFERENCES

Ansere, J. K. (1982) The inevitability of distance education in Africa. In J. S. Daniel, M. A. Stroud & J. R. Thompson (eds.) *Learning at a distance*. Edmonton, Alberta: Athabasca University/International Council for Correspondence Education, 53-61.

Atman, K. S. (1987). The role of conation (striving) in the distance learning enterprise. *American Journal of Distance Education, 1*, 14-24

Baath, J. (1982a). Teaching models for designing courses creatively. In J. S. Daniel, M. A. Stroud & J. R. Thompson (eds.) *Learning at a distance*. Edmonton, Alberta: Athabasca University/International Council for Correspondence Education, 37-40.

Baath, J. A. (1982b). Experimental research on computer-assisted distance education. In J. S. Daniel, M. A. Stroud & J. R. Thompson (eds.) *Learning at a distance*. Edmonton, Alberta: Athabasca University/International Council for Correspondence Education, 303-305.

Bains, G. A. (1985). A profile of adult educators in Canadian universities. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education, 11*, 12-26.

Bates, A. W. (1981). Research into the effectiveness of educational media. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 12*, 220-232.

Bates, T. (1986). Computer assisted learning or communications: which way for information technology in distance education? *Journal of Distance Education, 1*, 41-58.

Bolton, G. (1986). The Broady lecture: «The Opportunities of Distance». *Report of the Thirteenth World Conference of ICDE*. Melbourne, Australia. 13-20 August 1985.

Burge, E. J. (1984). Adult learning principles and distance learning design: bridging some professional distances. *Open Campus, 9*, 7-25.

Calvert, J. (1986). Research in Canadian distance education. In D. Kaufman and I. Mugridge (eds.) *Distance education in Canada*. London: Croom Helm, 94-110.

Clyde, A., Crowther, H., Patching, W., Putt, I. & Store, R. (1983). How students use distance teaching materials: an institutional study. *Distance Education, 4*, 4-26.

Coldeway, D. O. (1982). Recent research in distance learning. In J. S. Daniel, M. A. Stroud & J. R. Thompson (eds.) *Learning at a distance: a world perspective*. Edmonton, Alberta: Athabasca University/International Council for Correspondence Education, 29-37.

Coldeway, D. O. (1987). Behavior analysis in distance education: a systems perspective. *American Journal of Distance Education, 1*, 7-20.

Coldeway, D. O. & Spencer, R. E. (1982). Keller's Personalized System of Instruction: the search for a basic distance learning paradigm. *Distance Education, 3*, 51-71.

Daniel, J. S. (1983) Independence and interaction in distance education: new technologies for home study. *Programmed Learning and Educational Technology, 20*, 155-160.

Daniel, J. S. & Marquis, C. (1979). Independence and interaction: getting the mixture right. *Teaching at a Distance, 15*, 29-44.

Dodds, A. E. & Lawrence, J. A. (1983). Heuristics for planning university study at a distance. *Distance Education, 4*, 40-52.

Durward, G. W. & Durward, M. L. (1983). A telephone survey of distance education students at the Open Learning Institute. Unpublished report. The Open Learning Institute.

Ellis, J. F. & Mugridge, I. (1983). The Open Learning Institute of British Columbia: a case study. Distance Education Research Group Papers. The Open University, Number 8. Excerpted in *Educational Media International*, 1984, *3*, 21-32.

van Enckevort, G. (1984). Problems of research for a new Open University. *Distance Education, 5*, 72-83.

Farrell, G. M. & Haughey, M. (1986). The future of open learning. In I. Mugridge and D. Kaufman (eds.) *Distance education in Canada*, 30-35.

Foks, J. (1987). Towards open learning. In P. Smith and M. Kelly (eds.) *Distance education and the mainstream: convergence in education*. London: Croom Helm, 74-92.

Garrison, D. R. (1985). Three generations of technological innovations in distance education. *Distance Education, 6*, 235-241.

Garrison, D. R. (1987) Researching dropout in distance education. *Distance Education, 8*, 95-101.

Garrison, D. R. & Baynton, M. (1987). Beyond independence in distance education: the concept of control. *American Journal of Distance Education, 1*, 3-15.

Garrison, D. R. & Shale, D. G. (1987). Mapping the boundaries of distance education: problems in defining the field. *American Journal of Distance Education, 1*, 7-13.

Gitau, B. (1987). Achievement motivation is distance education. *International Council for Distance Education Bulletin, 14*, 37-47.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Harasim, L. (1986). Computer learning networks: edu-

cational applications of computer conferencing. *Journal of Distance Education, 1,* 59-70.

Harris, D. (1987). *Openness and closure in distance education.* London: The Falmer Press.

Harry, K. (1986). The International Centre for Distance Learning of the United Nations University: resources and services. *Journal of Distance Education, 1,* 77-79.

Henri, F. (1985). La formation à distance: définition et paradigme. In F. Henri and A. Kaye (eds.) *Le savoir à domicile: pédagogie et problématique de la formation à distance.* Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 5-28.

Henri, F. & Kaye, A. (1985). Enseignement à distance – apprentissage autonome? In F. Henri and A. Kaye (eds.) *Le savoir à domicile: pédagogie et problématique de la formation à distance.* Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 99-144.

Herrmann, A. (1988). A conceptual framework for understanding the transitions in perceptions of external students. *Distance Education, 9,* 5-26.

Holmberg, B. (1982). Recent research into distance education. Vol. 1 & 2. ZIFF Papiere. Hagen: Fernuniversität.

Holmberg, B. (1983). Guided didactic conversation in distance education. In D. Sewart, D. Keegan & B. Holmberg (eds.) *Distance education: international perspectives.* London: Croom Helm, 114-122.

Holmberg, B. (1986). *Growth and structure of distance education.* London: Croom Helm.

Howard, D. C. (1985). Reading and study skills and the distance learner. *Distance Education, 6,* 169-188.

Keegan, D. (1980). On defining distance education. *Distance Education, 1,* 13-36.

Kelly, M. & Shapcott, M. (1987). Towards understanding adult distance learners. *Open Learning, 2,* 3-10.

Kember, D. (1982). External science courses: the practical problems. *Distance Education, 3,* 207-225.

Kember, D. & Harper, G. (1987). Approaches to studying research and its implications for the quality of learning from distance education. *Journal of Distance Education, II,* 15-30.

Knapper, C. K. (1988). Lifelong learning and distance education. *American Journal of Distance Education, 2,* 63-72.

Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education.* New York: Association Press.

Lamy, T. & Henri, F. (1983). Télé-Université: ten years of distance education in Quebec. *Programmed Learning and Educational Technology, 20,* 197-201.

McIntosh, N. E., Woodley, A. & Morrison, V. (1980). Student demand and progress at the Open University – the first eight years. *Distance Education, 1,* 37-60.

Minnis, J. (1985). Ethnography, case study, grounded theory, and distance education research. *Distance Education, 6,* 189-198.

Moore, M. G. (1977). On a theory of independent study. Ziff-Papiere 16. Hagen: Fernuniversität.

Moore, M. G. (1985). Some observations on current research in distance education. *Epistolodidaktika, 1,* 35-62.

Moore, M. (1986). Self-directed learning and distance education. *Journal of Distance Education, 1,* 7-24.

Morgan, A. (1986). What shall we do about independent learning? *Teaching at a Distance, 26,* 38-45.

Neilsen, D. (1984). Research issues in distance education: report on a regional research group meeting. Universiti Sains Malaysia. *Pakistan Journal of Distance Education, 1,* 57-70.

Paul, R. (1987). Staff development needs for universities: mainstream and distance education. In P. Smith & M. Kelly (eds.) *Distance education and the mainstream: convergence in education,* 139-155.

Perraton, H. (1987). The roles of theory and generalisation in the practice of distance education. Ziff Papiere 67. Hagen: Fernuniversität.

Peruniak, G. S. (1984). The seminar as an instructional strategy in distance education. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 15,* 107-124.

Peters, O. (1983). Distance teaching and industrial production: a comparative interpretation in outline. In D. Sewart, D. Keegan & B. Holmberg (eds.) *Distance education: international perspectives.* London: Croom Helm: 95-113.

Reddy, G. R. (1987). Planning, management and monitoring of distance education. In *Distance education in Asia and the Pacific,* Volume I. Proceedings of the regional seminar on distance education. Manila: Asian Development Bank, 233-298.

Rumble, G. & Harry, K. (eds.) (1982). *The distance teaching universities.* London: Croom Helm.

Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner.* New York: Basic Books.

Shavelson, R. J., Webb, N. M. & Hotta, J. Y. (1987). The concept of exchangeability in designing telecourse evaluations. *Journal of Distance Education, 2,* 27-40.

Smith, P. & Kelly, M. (eds.) (1987). *Distance education and the mainstream: convergence in education.* London: Croom Helm.

Sparkes, J. J. (1983). The problem of creating a discipline of distance education. *Distance Education, 4,* 179-186.

Sweet, R. (1986). Student dropout in distance education: an application of Tinto's model. *Distance Education, 7,* 209-213.

Taylor, E. and Kaye, A. (1986). Andragogy by design? Control and self-direction in the design of an Open University course. *Programmed Learning and Educational Technology, 23,* 62-69.

Taylor, J. C. *et al.* (1986). Student persistence in distance education: a cross-cultural multi-institutional perspective. *Distance Education, 7,* 68-91.

Thompson, G. (1984). The cognitive style of field-dependence as an explanatory construct in distance education dropout. *Distance Education, 5,* 286-293.

Thompson, G. (1986). I'll know it when I see it: what is distance education? *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education, XII,* 83-91.

Timmers, S. & Mugridge, I. (1986). The Open Learning Institute: recent innovations. In C. Osborne (ed.) *International yearbook of educational and instructional technology 1986/87.* London and New York: Kogan Page/Nichols.

Tinto, V. (1975). Drop-out from higher education: a theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45,* 89-125.